REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the present amendments and following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-12, 14, and 15 are pending; Claims 1, 4, 6, 9, 11, and 14 are amended; Claims 3, 8, and 13 are canceled; and no claims are newly added herewith. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added by this amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 11-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101; Claims 1-4, 6-9, and 11-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Miyagawa et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,991,782, hereafter (Miyagawa); and Claims 5, 10, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Miyagawa in view of Lonnroth et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,826,597, hereafter Lonnroth).

With regard to the outstanding rejection of Claims 11-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 101, that rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 11 has been amended in a manner proposed by the outstanding Office Action to recite "a computer program product stored on a computer readable medium." Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

With regard to the outstanding rejection of Claims 1-4, 6-9, and 11-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Miyagawa, that rejection is also respectfully traversed.

In the past, in conventional worldwide web technology, there was no generic method for gathering necessary information from a plurality of web pages and composing this information into a single web page. In view of these difficulties, an object of the claimed invention is to provide a method and apparatus which are capable of composing a plurality of web documents on a single web document easily.[1]

As described in a non-limiting example in the specification, for example at page 11, commands are arranged in arbitrary positions within a composition web document for

[1] Specification, page 6, lines 21-24.

composing a plurality of web documents (e.g., partial documents) and the execution results of these commands are embedded at corresponding positions, such as server side inclusion, ASP, or JSP. The commands provided include a partial document insertion command indicating which portion of which web page is to be extracted and where that portion is to be inserted. A conversion command is also provided that is capable of applying a conversion processing with respect to an arbitrary range in a composition web document that provides a framework. This conversion command receives a range information and a conversion role as inputs and outputs a document obtained as a conversion result.

To this end, a description language for composing a plurality of web documents into a single web document is designed as an applied XML language (XML-P'z language). In the XML-P'z language, an insertion command "pz-targets" in a conversion command element "pz convert" are defined. The insertion command element extracts a partial document from an arbitrary web document and inserts the partial document into a single web document. The conversion command converts a document structure of the extracted partial document into a desired document structure according to the ranges for which the document structure is to be converted and a conversion rule for converting the document structure into a desired document structure.[2]

According to one non-limiting example in the present specification, an XML-P'z document shown in Figure 16 for converting a textbook data is expressed by "textbook" element E1, and is contained in a web document at http://www.xxx.com/booklist.xml. Data at element E1 is to be inserted by the pz-targets element E2 into a common book format according to the conversion rule described in an XSLT document "textboo-book.xsl" and then output as a composed web document W1 (which may be an XML document). This operation includes the following: (1) an interpreter 102 carries out an interpretation

[2] Specification, page 10, line 14 – page 35, line 21.

processing of the pz targets element E2 in the XML-DOM tree shown in Figure 17; and (2) the interpreter 102 carries out an interpretation processing of the pz convert element E3 in the XML-DOM tree shown in Figure 17.

In step 1, as shown in Figure 18, a target's command processor 122 exchanges the XML-DOM tree of the partial document by replacing the pz convert element E2 with a new partial document element group E2'. A plurality of textbook data exists in the web document at http://www.xxx.com/booklist.xml, and all of this data is inserted as XML-DOM trees of the partial document in the web document.

In the second step, the interpretation processing of the pz convert element E3 is carried out using an XSLT document shown in Figure 19. The XSLT document describes a conversion rule for converting a publication element, a price element, and an author element respectively. In this non-limiting example, the textbook data contained in the first document and the data extracted from the web document at http://www.xxx.com/booklist.xml are data having the same structure, so that the conversion of the structure using XSLT may be described using the element expressed as E1.

As shown in Figure 16, the value of the publication element is "selected short stories of Shinichiro Hamada" and this value becomes the value of the title element after conversion. Also, as illustrated in Figure 16, the value of the author element is Shinichiro Hamada, and this value remains unchanged after the conversion. As further shown in Figure 16, the value of the price element is 55, and this value remains unchanged after the conversion. A convert command processor 123 exchanges the XML-DOM tree of the partial document after the conversion with the pz convert element E3 as a new element E3' so as to generate the XML-DOM tree and the document structure shown in Figure 20.

To this end, as amended, independent Claims 1, 6, and 11 recite in part,

> converting a document structure of the second document according to ranges for which the document structure of the second document is to be converted including the partial documents inserted by the inserting step and an identification of a file describing a conversion rule for converting the document structure into a desired document structure, which are described by the specific markup language in the second document.

By contrast, Miyagawa relates to a document creation support system for extracting necessary information (fghi) from a first document (XXX 201) described in any markup language, and inserting the necessary information (fghi) into the second document while (YYY 209) described by a specific markup language.[3] However, the document structure of the (YYY 209) remains unchanged. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Miyagawa fails to disclose or suggest converting a document structure into a desired document structure as exemplified by "the value of one element becoming the value of another element after the conversion" according to ranges for which the document structure is to be converted and a conversion rule for converting the document structure.

As Miyagawa fails to disclose or suggest the limitations recited in independent Claims 1, 6, and 11, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1, 6, and 11 patentably distinguish over Miyagawa. It is therefore respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

With respect to the outstanding rejection of Claims 5, 10, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Miyagawa in view of Lonnroth, that rejection is also respectfully traversed. Claims 5, 10, and 15 depend from independent Claims 1, 6, and 11, respectively.

As noted above, Miyagawa fails to disclose or suggest the features recited in independent Claims 1, 6, and 11. Because Lonnroth is not relied upon by the outstanding

[3] Miyagawa, col. 6, line 5 – col. 7, line 9 and Fig. 6A.

Office Action to provide the features identified as deficient within Miyagawa, Lonnroth is not substantively addressed herewith. It is therefore respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that there is no basis in the teachings of either Miyagawa or Lonnroth to support the applied combination. Certainly, the Examiner fails to cite to any specific teachings in either of Miyagawa or Lonnroth to provide proper motivation for the applied combination. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the combination of Miyagawa and Lonnroth is the result of hindsight reconstruction, and is improper.

Consequently, in view of the foregoing discussion and present amendments, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Katherine D. Pauley

Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Katherine D. Pauley
Registration No. 50,607

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

EHK/KDP/law
I:\ATTY\KDP\21'S\217398US\217398USAM 4-7-05.DOC